



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,089	12/06/2001	Gary Cole	WAVE1110-1	8837
<div>7590 10/31/2007</div> <div>ROBERT C. KOWERT MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398</div>				
			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>YIGDALL, MICHAEL J</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>2192</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>10/31/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,089

Applicant(s)

COLE, GARY

Examiner

Michael J. Yigdall

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to Applicant's submission filed on August 10, 2007.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14-33 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. The rejection of claims 6, 14 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment...

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as set forth below. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,724,575 to Hoover et al. (art of record, "Hoover") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,405 to Dutcher et al. (now made of record, "Dutcher").

With respect to claim 1 (currently amended), Hoover teaches a system for managing information (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

a software program stored on a computer-readable medium operable to maintain an identity index (see, for example, object location service 135 and map table 120 in FIG. 6, and column 23, lines 34-37, which shows that object location service 135 is operable to maintain map table 120, and see, for example, column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is an identity index), wherein said identity index comprises:

(a) a virtual identity (see, for example, map table 120 in FIG. 7, which shows a plurality of virtual identities).

Hoover further teaches that the virtual identity is for a user (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-37), and further teaches multiple computer resources at which information objects are located (see, for example, user computers 12 in FIG. 6, and see below). However, in the sense that the user is not necessarily an operator of the multiple computer resources, Hoover does not expressly disclose that the virtual identity is “for a user of multiple computer resources.”

Nonetheless, Hoover further teaches that the information objects comprise user accounts (see, for example, column 27, lines 43-49, which shows an information object that comprises a person’s account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.). One of ordinary skill in the art could apply the teachings of Hoover, with predictable results, to the user accounts of those who operate the multiple computer resources.

For example, in an analogous art, Dutcher describes a need for managing different user accounts on multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single user account definition (see, for example, column 1, lines 37-47). Indeed, the teachings of Hoover enable the

Art Unit: 2192

management of different, heterogeneous user databases on multiple computer resources based on a single, homogenous data model (see, for example, the abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Hoover such that the virtual identity is “for a user of multiple computer resources,” as Dutcher suggests.

Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches the virtual identity further comprising:

(i) a plurality of information object identifiers each corresponding to a respective information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object identifiers that each correspond to an information object); and

(ii) for each information object, a resource name identifying one of the multiple computer resources at which said respective information object is located, wherein said resource name is associated with said respective information object identifier (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource name “RDB1” associated with information object identifier “0011” that identifies a resource at which the information object is located); and

(b) a resource definition corresponding to each respective said named resource, wherein the resource definition further comprises connection information (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition corresponding to the resource that includes an object attribute table “OAT1,” and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 2 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said resource definition further comprises a schema map

Art Unit: 2192

(see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 3 (original), the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 4 (original), the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that a virtual attribute value for said virtual attribute is stored in RAM (see, for example, column 27, lines 14-18, which shows that the values of the virtual attributes in the object attribute table are stored in memory).

With respect to claim 6 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said connection information contains a connection parameter selected from one of a hostname, a port, a resource username, a resource password or a resource type (see, for example, column 25, lines 12-16, which shows that the connection information includes parameters such as a hostname and port).

With respect to claim 8 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said information object comprises a user account (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that comprises a user

Art Unit: 2192

account, such as a person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 9 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said information object identifier comprises an account name (see, for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier "0012" that comprises an account name such as "John Doe").

With respect to claim 10 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 11 (original), the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 12 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that a virtual attribute value for said virtual attribute is maintained in RAM (see, for example, column 27, lines 14-18, which shows that the values of the virtual attributes in the object attribute table are stored in memory).

With respect to claim 14 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said connection information contains a connection parameter selected from one of a hostname, a port, a resource username, a resource password or a resource type (see, for example, column 25, lines 12-16, which shows that the connection information includes parameters such as a hostname and port).

With respect to claim 15 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said resource is one of a Unix system, a Windows NT system, an Oracle database system or an email server (see, for example, column 12, lines 61-63, which shows that the resource is a Unix system).

With respect to claim 16 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said software program is operable to connect to said resource based on said resource definition (see, for example, column 25, lines 16-19, which shows that the software program connects to the resource based on the connection information).

With respect to claim 17 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map); and

wherein, said software program is operable to create a composite view of said virtual identity based on said schema map (see, for example, column 25, lines 20-35, which shows creating a composite view of the virtual identity).

With respect to claim 18 (original), the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said software program is operable to present a representation of said composite view in a graphical user interface (see, for example, FIG. 24, which shows a representation of the composite view in a graphical user interface).

With respect to claim 19 (original), the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that said graphical user interface is customizable (see, for example, column 52, lines 13-32, which shows that the graphical user interface is customizable).

With respect to claim 20 (currently amended), Hoover teaches a system for managing information (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

a software program stored on a computer-readable medium operable to maintain an identity index (see, for example, object location service 135 and map table 120 in FIG. 6, and column 23, lines 34-37, which shows that object location service 135 is operable to maintain map table 120, and see, for example, column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is an identity index), wherein said identity index comprises:

(a) a plurality of virtual identities (see, for example, map table 120 in FIG. 7, which shows a plurality of virtual identities), wherein each virtual identity corresponds to a user (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-37, which shows a virtual identity that corresponds to a user).

Hoover further teaches multiple computer resources at which information objects are located (see, for example, user computers 12 in FIG. 6, and see below). However, in the sense that the user to which the virtual identity corresponds is not necessarily an operator of the

Art Unit: 2192

multiple computer resources, Hoover does not expressly disclose that the virtual identity “corresponds to a user of multiple computer resources.”

Nonetheless, Hoover further teaches that the information objects comprise user accounts (see, for example, column 27, lines 43-49, which shows an information object that comprises a person’s account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.). One of ordinary skill in the art could apply the teachings of Hoover, with predictable results, to the user accounts of those who operate the multiple computer resources.

For example, in an analogous art, Dutcher describes a need for managing different user accounts on multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single user account definition (see, for example, column 1, lines 37-47). Indeed, the teachings of Hoover enable the management of different, heterogeneous user databases on multiple computer resources based on a single, homogenous data model (see, for example, the abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Hoover such that the virtual identity “corresponds to a user of multiple computer resources,” as Dutcher suggests.

Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that each virtual identity further comprises:

(i) a plurality of information object identifiers, wherein each information object identifier corresponds to a respective information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object identifiers that each correspond to an information object); and

(ii) a plurality of resource names, wherein each resource name is associated with an information object identifier and each resource name corresponds to one of the

Art Unit: 2192

multiple computer resources at which the information object corresponding to the associated information object identifier is located (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource name “RDB1” associated with information object identifier “0011” that identifies a resource at which the information object is located); and

(b) a plurality of resource definitions comprising a resource definition for each named computer resource, wherein each resource definition comprises connection information for the corresponding named computer resource (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition corresponding to the resource that includes an object attribute table “OAT1,” and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 21 (original), the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that each resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 22 (original), the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that each information object comprises a user account (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that comprises a user account, such as a person’s account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 23 (original), the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that each information object identifier comprises an account

Art Unit: 2192

name (see, for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier “0012” that comprises an account name such as “John Doe”).

With respect to claim 24 (original), the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that each resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 25 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated, and Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches that each said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 26 (currently amended), Hoover teaches a method of managing information (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

storing an identity index comprising a plurality of information object identifiers corresponding to a set of information objects that define a user (see, for example, map table 120 in FIG. 6, and column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is an identity index, and see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object identifiers that each correspond to an information object, and column 27, lines 34-37, which shows an information object that defines a user).

Hoover further teaches multiple computer resources at which information objects are located (see, for example, user computers 12 in FIG. 6, and see below). However, in the sense

Art Unit: 2192

that the user whom the information objects define is not necessarily an operator of the multiple computer resources, Hoover does not expressly disclose that the user is “a user of multiple computer resources.”

Nonetheless, Hoover further teaches that the information objects comprise user accounts (see, for example, column 27, lines 43-49, which shows an information object that comprises a person’s account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.). One of ordinary skill in the art could apply the teachings of Hoover, with predictable results, to the user accounts of those who operate the multiple computer resources.

For example, in an analogous art, Dutcher describes a need for managing different user accounts on multiple, heterogeneous computer resources based on a single user account definition (see, for example, column 1, lines 37-47). Indeed, the teachings of Hoover enable the management of different, heterogeneous user databases on multiple computer resources based on a single, homogenous data model (see, for example, the abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Hoover such that the user is “a user of multiple computer resources,” as Dutcher suggests.

Hoover in view of Dutcher further teaches:

associating a resource definition with each information object identifier, wherein each resource definition corresponds to a different one of the multiple computer resources at which the information object corresponding to the associated information object identifier is located, and wherein each resource definition contains connection information for the corresponding computer resource (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition

Art Unit: 2192

associated with information object identifier “0011” and corresponding to a resource at which the information object is located that includes an object attribute table “OAT1,” and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 27 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches that each information object identifier from said plurality of information object identifiers comprises a native key for the corresponding information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 8-16, which shows that the information object identifiers comprise native keys for the corresponding information objects).

With respect to claim 28 (original), the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches that said native key comprises an account name (see, for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier “0012” that comprises an account name such as “John Doe”).

With respect to claim 29 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches that said associating a resource definition with each information object identifier further comprises associating at least one resource name with each information object identifier (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource name “RDB1” associated with information object identifier “0011”).

With respect to claim 30 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches that each information object comprises a user account (see, for

Art Unit: 2192

example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that comprises a user account, such as a person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 31 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches that each resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 32 (original), the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches that said schema map maps a resource attribute to a virtual attribute (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 33 (original), the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated, and Hoover in view Dutcher further teaches creating a composite view of a user based on said schema map from each resource definition (see, for example, column 25, lines 20-35, which shows creating a composite view of a user).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2192

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Yigdall whose telephone number is (571) 272-3707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

My

Michael J. Yigdall
Examiner
Art Unit 2192

mjy



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER